

Approved For Release 2000 (02 ACS-STP) 0788R001800080001-5

CONTENTS (U)

LIST	OF	ILLUS	ΓRAT	IONS	3 ((U)	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•		•	•	•	•	•	•		•	•	iii
LIST	OF	TABLE	s (U) .	•		•	•		•	•				•		•		•	•	•	•	•		•	•	iv
I	ова	JECTIV	E (U) .									•								•				•	•	1
II	INT	RODUC	rion	(U)		•		•		•		•	•	•		•		•		•			•				2
III	ANA	ALYSIS	PRO	TOCO	DL	(υ	()					•	•				•		•	•				•	•		4
IV	CON	CLUSI	ONS	(U)		•							•		•			•	•	•		•		•	•		11
Apper	ndia	(AE	VALU	ATIC	N	OF	F	'OU	R	CC	OF	RDI	NA.	TE	F	REM	101	Έ	V I	EW	/IN	IGS	3 ((U)).		12
Appe	ndia	8S	UMMA	RY (F	EV	'ΑΙ	,UA	TI	101	1 1	EC	CHN	IIC	(UE	3	U)					•			•4		43
REFE	REN	CES (U																									44

ii

UNCLASSIFIED

Approved For Release 2000/08/08: CIA-RDP96-00788R001800080001-5

FIGURES (U)

1	Sample RV Assessment Form (U)	5
A-1	Transcript 1 (U)	14
A-2	Transcript 2 (U)	15
A-3	Transcript 3 (U)	16
A-4	Transcript 4 (U)	17
A-5	Target Site Hangö (U)	19
A-6	Target Site Fernando de Noronha (U)	20
A-7	Target Site Inverness (U)	21
A-8	Target Site Punkaharju (U)	22

iii

Approved For Release 2010 ASSIFIED-00788R001800080001-5

TABLES (U)

1	Task-Defined Relevance Scale for Target Elements (U)	6
2	Quality Assessment Scale (U)	8
3	Numerical Score Conversion Table (U)	8
A-1	Target Element Relevance Ratings for Hango (U)	23
A-2	Target Element Relevance Ratings for Inverness (U)	23
A-3	Target Element Relevance Ratings for Fernando de Noronha (U)	24
A-4	Target Element Relevance Ratings for Punkaharju (U)	24
A-5	RV Assessment Forms for Calibration of Remote Viewing (U)	2.
A-6	A Rank Ordering of Weighted Averages (U)	4

iv

Approved For Release 2000 No. 61: ASSIFFED 0788R001800080001-5

I OBJECTIVE (U)

(U) The objective of this task was to develop an evaluation procedure to assess the relative quality of a set of different remote viewing (RV) responses.

Approved For Release 2000/08/08 : CIA-RDP96-00788R001800080001-5 **UNCLASSIFIED**

II INTRODUCTION (U)

(U) In addressing the remote viewing (RV) evaluation question, we consider two separate requirements:

- Absolute evaluation of a single response for a single unknown target.
- Relative evaluation of a set of responses for a series of known targets.

The first of these is of the most interest in an operational setting. As part of the RV enhancement task, we have considered this problem in two ways. First, by conducting an operational RV session between two calibration RV sessions, a tentative a priori assessment of operational efficacy can be determined. The evaluation is made on the basis of performance during the calibration sessions, and on the basis of adherence to a predetermined session structure.

- (U) A second technique for an a priori evaluation was explored as part of the Fiscal Year 1982 program in an audio-linguistic task. This task provided indications that careful linguistic analysis, when coupled with technical audio analysis, could yield an assessment in the absence of knowledge about the target.
- (U). Various techniques have been used in the past^{1*} in an attempt to solve the relative evaluation problem. The most common of these was the simple rank ordering of all responses, as assessed against all possible targets used in an experimental series. In this procedure, a judge is presented with n RV transcripts and n target sites. His task is to arrange

⁽U) References are listed at the end of this report.

Approved For Release 2000/08/08 : CIA-RDP96-00788R001800080001-5

(U)

the transcripts in order of the best to least match for each of the n targets. A simple numerical counting procedure is then used to estimate the likelihood that the judge's transcript/target_matches are by chance alone. This early technique contained little systematic structure for determining the final order of matches.

The first step toward systematizing the rank order judging procedure was to preprocess the raw data in the transcript by "conceptualizing" both the verbal and the pictorial responses. Conceptualizing a transcript requires an analyst to paraphrase the transcript into a list of coherent statements. This concept list is then compared and scored concept-by-concept to each of the targets in the experiment. The resulting scores are averaged for each response, and all responses are rank-ordered on the basis of these scores. This improved analysis procedure was applied to a number of experiments within the Technology Transfer Task

(U) The problem with the above technique is that there are no guidelines as to how the analyst should paraphrase the transcript; furthermore, the method in which the concepts are to be assessed against the targets remains undefined. The purpose of the Evaluation Task in FY 1982 was to identify a procedure that corrected these deficiencies.

III ANALYSIS PROTOCOL (U)

- (U) To quantify the analysis procedure, we have divided the task into four separate areas: subject response, target/task definition, quality assessment, and numerical analysis. Figure 1 is a sample RV Assessment Form that has been designed to emphasize the separation of the analysis tasks. Each of the parts of the form are described below.
- (U) The subject's response should be prepared for analysis without any knowledge of either the target site or the overall task. The aim of this method of response preparation is to reduce a possibly redundant, rambling response to a coherent set of concepts. To meet this requirement we have developed a set of initial guidelines to the conceptualization procedure.
- (U) A concept is defined as a paraphrase of a single idea that has been expressed in the RV verbal or drawing response. That coherent idea should not be fragmented into component parts. For example, a response might be of the form, "I see a large, textured, gray building." The single concept that expresses this idea should be "large, textured, gray building," rather than four separate concepts—one for each word in the phrase. Each concept should be entered under the "Transcript Concept" column in the RV Assessment Form.
- (t) For this initial evaluation technique, a particular concept should be used only once in the analysis. (Some weighting factor proportional to concept frequency could be utilized, but, for the initial attempt, only unique concepts are used.) If in the construction of the transcript concept list a concept later in the transcript is a duplicate of an earlier one, it should be so noted by placing the concept number of the original concept in the "D" column.

4

Approved For Release 40064A SSIFIED 6-00788R001800080001-5 Normalized Score 2.86 3.57 3.93 4.29 49.4 5.00 2.50 0.36 1.07 3.21 0.00 0.71 14 Score 77 13 10 4 22 20 Weighted Average Score Quality (Q) Date: Ý1σwer: Class: 14 13 12 Element of Target 11 10 6 Method of Targeting: ۵ Target: Session: ĸ es Transcript Concept Ø 0 Length of Session: Begin Time: End Time: 14 13 2 = 12 TRANSCRIPT EVALUATION

FIGURE 1 SAMPLE RV ASSESSMENT FORM (U)

Approved For Release 2000/08/08 : CIA-RDP96-00788R001800080001-5

- assessment, it is necessary to define, in advance, what the goals of the assessment are. In the RV Assessment Form, columns "Element of Target" and "Relevance" are provided to clearly define the goal of the analysis. In the ideal situation, an RV target should be completely specified in advance. A target typically consists of a number of target elements, each of which may have varying relevance with regard to the overall RV task. For any given target, an independent list of target elements should be prepared. The selection of what constitutes a target element, is left completely to the discretion of the task coordinator. The target element must be selected with little regard to task relevance (target element relevance is accounted for later). Because an RV target consists, in principle, of an essentially infinite number of possible elements, discretion needs to be exercised in the selection process.
- (U) For each target element identified for the site, the task coordinator must define a relevance rating. This rating allows the coordinator to tailor the analysis to the task requirements. Table 1 shows the scale that is used for the target element relevance rating.

Table 1

(U) TASK-DEFINED RELEVANCE SCALE FOR TARGET ELEMENTS (U)

Rating	Relevance Scale
1	A target element of trivial interest
2	A target element of minor interest
3	A target element of intermediate interest
4	A target element of major interest
5	A target element of key interest

Approved For Release **UNGUASSAFIED**6-00788R001800080001-5

- (U) For each transcript concept on the RV Assessment Form (Figure 1), the analyst should attempt to find the element on the list of target elements that he/she considers to be the best match. The analyst should be quite liberal in the concept/element matching (i.e., the quality of the match should be considered at this point in the analysis). If he/she is able to identify a target element that might be considered a match to the given concept, a 1 is placed in the "p" (present) column on the assessment form. If no element can be identified, a 0 is placed in the "p" column. After making a target element identification, the selected target element, and its corresponding overall relevance rating should be entered in the appropriate columns on the assessment form.
- (U) Having identified a corresponding target element for each concept, it is now appropriate to assess the quality of the match. The quality assessment is done on the basis of how well the single concept in question matches the selected target element. The judgement is to be made without regard to any other issues, such as importance of the concept to the transcript, or importance (relevance) of the target element to the target. Table 2 shows the quality assessment scale that is used for this part of the analysis. The appropriate quality score from Table 2 is entered in the "Quality" column on the RV Assessment Form for each concept for which a matching target element has been identified.
- (U) An intermediate numerical score is computed for each concept from the relevance and quality (Tables 1 and 2) evaluation as follows:

 $S' = P \times R \times Q$,

where P is the value in the "p" column (0 or 1); R is the relevance evaluation; and 0 is the quality assessment. S' can assume values ranging between 0 and 25. Table 3 demonstrates how to determine the final score, S, for a given value of S' for each concept. The conversion table is

7

Approved For Release 200 108 485 514 HED 96-00788 R001800080001-5

Table 2
(U) QUALITY ASSESSMENT SCALE (U)

	Scale
Rating	Discrimination Scale
1	Poor description; only one or two aspects of the material match. Fair description; a few aspects of the material match, but a
2	l 1-mag ambiguity exists.
3	Reasonable description; many aspects of the material match, but there remains some ambiguity.
4	Good description; a large number of aspects of the material matches, but it is possible to conceive of material that would be a better match.
5	Excellent description; all or nearly all aspects of the material match.

Table 3

(U) NUMERICAL SCORE CONVERSION TABLE (U)

$S = P \times R \times Q$	Score	Normalized Score
	0	0.00
0		0.35
1	1	
, 2	2	0.71
3	3	1.07
4	4	1.43
5	5	1.79
6	6	2.14
8	7	2.50
9	8 1	2.86
10	9	3.21
12	10	3.57
15	11	3.93
16	12	4.29
20	13	4.64
25	14	5.00

8

Approved For Release 2000/08/08 : CIA-RDP96-00788R001800080001-5 **UNCLASSIFIED**

(U) used to eliminate the nonuniformly-distributed gaps in scoring numbers that occur if one simply uses the product S'. Thus, the final score for each concept ranges from 0 to a maximum of 14. This conversion table is provided as part of the RV Assessment Form.

- (U) If an assessment of an individual concept is required, the final score for each concept/target-element match can be related to the quality assessment scale by using the conversions shown in the third column of Table 3 and on the assessment sheet. It should be noted, however, that the integer scores are used to simplify the remaining calculations.
- (U) To determine a final evaluation of the complete transcript assessed against a given target, a weighted average of concept scores is computed. To assist in the calculation of the weighted average, a tally box score is provided at the bottom of the RV Assessment Form. For each of the possible scores, 0 through 14, the number of concepts that attained that particular score are counted. For example, if 3 concepts were evaluated with a score of 12, a 3 is entered in the box below the 12 score. If the frequency of occurrence of score S_j is f_j, then the final weighted average is computed by

$$A_{k}' = \Sigma f_{j} \sqrt{f_{j}} X S_{j}/\Sigma f_{j} \sqrt{f_{j}} .$$

$$A_{k} = 0.357 A_{k}'$$

(U) The normalized, weighted average score, $\mathbf{A}_{\mathbf{k}}$, is entered in the weighted average box on the assessment sheet. The weighted average score has been normalized to be within the range

$$0 \le A_k \le 5.0$$
.

To aid in the interpretation of the result, the quality assessment scale (Table 2) can be used to assess quality of the match between the whole RV response and the given target site.

(U) At this point in the evaluation protocol, the following options are available, depending on the task requirement:

۵

Approved For Release 2000/08/08 : CIA PDP06-00788R001800080001-5

(U)

- An n X n rank ordering on the basis of the weighted averages.
- A simple selection of the best match.
- A statistical evaluation on a concept-by-concept basis.

IV CONCLUSIONS (U)

A protocol has been developed to address the relative evaluation portion of the overall RV transcript assessment problem. As a demonstration of the technique, we provide in Appendix A an analysis of a series of four remote viewings that were performed as calibrations

In this series the remote viewing products were of relatively high quality, but nonetheless require a sensitive technique to differentiate because of the similarity of the targets and, hence, of the descriptions. (The series was chosen primarily for that reason.) Application of the assessment technique resulted in the correct blind matching (highest scoring in matches versus cross matches) of three of the four.

(U) Appendix B is a one page, step-by-step procedure for the application of this evaluation technique.

MARIE IN INCIDIO

(U) The material in this document thus constitutes an instruction manual or protocol for application of a step-by-step procedure for quantitative assessment of the relative target/transcript correlations of a series of transcripts matched into a series of targets.

Appendix A

EVALUATION OF FOUR COORDINATE REMOTE VIEWINGS (U)

Approved For Release 2000/08/08 : CIA-RDP96-00788R001800080001-5

On 14 December 1981, four coordinate remote viewings were conducted as calibrations

These four calibrations were chosen as a test bed for the evaluation procedure for the following reasons, (1) they were conducted in an setting, and (2) the targets had many similar features, and would thus provide a sensitive test of the protocol.

- Figures A-1 through A-4 are the transcripts that were presented to the analyst. They are exactly as they were when collected, except that the coordinates have been removed. Figures A-5 through A-8 are the National Geographic magazine targets that were used during the calibration sessions. Finally, the task coordinator provided Tables A-1 through A-4 as target element relevance scales for the four targets in Figures A-5 through A-8. This completes the information that was given to the analyst, and thus the analysis was carried out blind as to the matching target/transcript pairs.
- (U) Table A-5 is a compilation of the completed work sheets that were used by the analyst in this evaluation. They are shown in groups by session number, and alphabetized on the four targets. (The task coordinator first randomized the transcript order then assigned the session number used above.) For each of the transcripts, the analyst simply included all phrases and all drawings as concepts. For example, seven concepts were found during Session 2.
- (U) All concepts were then analyzed as described in the text. The matching target element, its relevance rating, and the computed score are shown for all possible combinations of transcript/target pairs in Table A-5. The score distributions and their resulting weighted averages are also shown in Table A-5.

Approved For Release Conference Approved For Release Conferenc	
	14 Dec81
	002 B
TM	•
Break.	12.40
$_{2}$ \bigwedge	
A up oclow	~
\mathbb{R}	
32 rocky	
	A
ad coastal cets	
Brich	
, , , , ,	
0 M 0 $1/w$	
$\binom{3}{4}$	
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	King
Rolf Rolf	e)
o ven Beautiful -	
Al very Beautiful -	
FIGURE A-1 TRANSCRIPT 1 (U)	

14 Dec 81 002 B 3.23

Aolfondoni N 777 Break.

1

A straight angles
B -

Manoch

sins

Building .

End

FIGURE A-2 TRANSCRIPT 2 (U)

15

Approved For Release PPA CLOA SSAFFE 6-00788R001800080001-5 TRANSCRIPT 3 (U) FIGURE A-3 16 **UNCLASSIFIED**

Approved For Release 2000/08/08 : CIA-RDP96-00788R001800080001-5

Approved For Release **LINGS SSIFF D**6-00788R001800080001-5 10/ Dec 81 B 12.46 12.417 A down passed
B
A flat
B water?

Break

Sizements and?

Breaks. aals mindris river. Jungle. A downfup. B deep vally.

FIGURE A-4(a) TRANSCRIPT 4 (U)

17






FIGURE A-4(b) TRANSCRIPT 4 (concluded) (U)



UNCLASSIFIED

Approved For Release 2000/08/08 : CIA-RDP96-00788R001800080001-5


CPYRGHT UNCLASSIFIED



UNCLASSIFIED

CPYRGHT

UNCLASSIFIED



UNCLASSIFIED
Approved For Release 2000/08/08 : CIA-RDP96-00788R001800080001-5

Approved For Release 2000/08/08: CIA-RDP96-00788R001800080001-5

CPYRGHT

UNCLASSIFIED




Table A-1

(U) TARGET ELEMENT RELEVANCE RATINGS FOR HANGÖ (U)

Target Element	Relevance
Town	5
Cold	4
Peninsula	5
Rocky	3
Vegetation	2
Вау	3

Table A-2

(U) TARGET ELEMENT RELEVANCE RATINGS FOR INVERNESS (U)

Target Element	Relevance
City	5
River	4
Bridge	. 3
River banks	2
Vegetation	1

23

Approved For Release 20 10 6 - A SSIFIED 0788R001800080001-5

Table A-3

(U) TARGET ELEMENT RELEVANCE RATINGS FOR FERNANDO DE NORONHA (U)

Target Element	Relevance
Island	5
Surf	3
Hills	4
Uninhabited	3
Mountain peak	3
Temperate climate	2
Vegetation	2
Ocean	4

Table A-4

(U) TARGET ELEMENT RELEVANCE RATINGS
FOR PUNKAHARJU (U)

Target Element	Relevance
Connect lakes	5
Town	4
Bridges	2
Cold	4
Vegetation	1
Islands	4

24

End Time:					Met	Method of Targeting:	f Tar	get11	Se	Coord	Coordinates			Dat	Date:	14 December 1981	mber 1	18
Length of Session:	f Sessi	lon:		. 1	Ses	Session:								បី	Class:	В		
Concept Number		, =	Transcript Concept	loept			A	Α.	Ele	Element of Target	f Ten	get	35	Teller Teller (R)	Quality (Q)	Score	P Q	Boore
1	Pict	Picture 1						1	Twin c	Twin church towers	tower		-	1	1	-	°	°
8	Pict	Picture 2		•			1										<u> </u>	_
က	Up at	Up and down	g					1	Buildings	пgв				2	1	5	C4	69
4	Rocky						-	0								0	m	6
ĸ	Land	/wate:	Land/water interface						River					4	4	12	4	4
9	Pict	Picture 3							Twin c	Twin church towers	tower	w w		1	1	1	8	10
7	Pict	Picture 4						н	River					4	7	12	9	9
80	Uprising	sing					-	1	Buildings	ngs				သ	1	5	~	7
6	CLIEF	4.						0								0	æ	80
10	Fjords	ds						1	River					S	1	2	01	6
11	Coas	Coastal city	ıty					1	City					5	4	20	12	οι
12								_									15	11
13								-					-				16	13
. 14								-									20	13
15							-	H					$\vdash \vdash$				25	7,2
š	Score	0	1 2	3 4	5	9	1	œ	6	101	=	12 1	13 1	14				
# of Concepts	at the	،		í	í		Γ	ŀ			\vdash	-	-	<u> </u>	Me	weignted Average	Aver	age

RV ASSESSMENT FORMS FOR CALIBRATION OF REMOTE VIEWING (U)

TABLE A-5

Approved For Release 2000/08/08: CTA-RDP96-00788R001800080001-5

	I																			2.52
			8core	٥	1	63	က	*	6	٥	4	80		21	7	12	13	77		υ 00
	14 December 1981	М	Pydyg	٥	-	61	m	4	10	9	60	0.	01	12	15	16	20	25		weignted Aveidge
#005	cembe		[2]	œ .		2			64	9	n	6	89	14						רפת
	14 D		Score				11	13						1				\vdash		187
V1ewer:	Date:	Class:	Quality (Q)	ო		1	2	4	1	61	1	7	1	2					E	
Ā	ä	ទ	Rele- vance (R)	8		သ	က	ID.	23	ო	၈	2	es	5					14	-
ı	1	- 1																	13	
		-	rget Lget																12	
	nates		of Ta								pu								11	-1
	Coordinates		Element of Target			ugs					of land								10	
ႏွ	- 1	٦	Elei	Rocks		Buildings	Rocks	Coast	Church	Bay	Slope of	Coast	Bay	City					6	1
Hangö	Method of Targeting:			1		1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	-		_			8,	1
	f Tar		A		1									-					7	
Target:	poq	Session:																	9	1
Tar	Met	Sea																	5	2
					4	,													7	1
			ouceb					10											3	1
			1pt C					rface											2	2
			-Transcript Concept			e		Land/water interfaces						t,	ŀ				1	4
12:40		:uc	4,	re 1	re 2	d dow		water	re 3	re 4	a gr		82	Coastal city					0	
••		Sessi		Picture 1	Mcture 2	Up and down	Rocky	Land/	Mcture	Picture	Uprising	CLLff	Fjords	Coast					Score	ts
Begin Time:	End Time:	Length of Session:	Concept	1	2	60	4	20	9	-	00	6	9	Ħ	21	13	7	51	Sec	# of Concepts
Begis	End	Leng	S K						<u> </u>		<u></u>									of C
								N	OITA	EAVIY	TqI	PANSCI	ЯŢ							*

26

Targeting: Coordinates Targeting: Targeting: Target Ta	End Time: Metho	Length of Session: Session:	Concept Transcript Concept	1 Picture 1	2 Picture 2	3 Up and down	4 Rocky	S Land/water interface	6 Picture 3	7 Picture 4	8 Upwising	9 Cliff	10 Fjords	11 Coastal city	12	13	14	15	
Class: Date:	d of Targ	ä	-	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0					-
Class: C	eting:			-						Islan	\vdash	Peak							╽┝
Class: Class: (C) 2 2 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4		-	ement of				line	TQ.		g			5 0						
Date: Cluss: Clu	tes		Target																
Date: Class: C	1		2.5																;
	Date	Clas	-	4		3	1	2	8	- C	4	5	3				-	-	
Documber 11 1 2 2 3 12 13 15 2 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	- 1			-		1	2		8		2		2						
	Эесешре	п	2	N		e	2	67	9	s,	7	11	9	0					
			Score	٥	-	77	6	•	•	•	١-	œ	6	10	11	12	13	7.	
8 8 7 8 8 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	1																		

Table A-5 (continued)

27

Approved For Release 2000/08/08 : CIA-RDP96-00788R001800080001-5

1	1	ŀ																			0.00	
	186		Γ	Bcore	۰	-	61	0	•	60	9	-		6	10	11	13	13	14	Ī	age	
	iber 1			PyRyd	۰	-	82	m	*	•	6	60	6	10	12	15	16	20	25	·	Aver	
#005	14 December 1981	м		Score	0	1	4	٥	13	0	6	٥	0	ro	10						Weighted Average	
Viewer:		Class:		Quality (Q)			-		4		82			-	က						We]
Vie	Date:	Cla	100	(E)			4		22		2			S	4					14	T	
		1	ŀ																	113	\downarrow	
				get																112	+	_
	nates		$\ \ $	f Tar					akes		akes			lakes						17	\downarrow	\dashv
	Coordinates	_		Element of Target					Connected lakes		Connected lakes			Connected lakes					.	101	1	
arju				Elei			Town		Jonne		Connec			Conne	Town					6	\downarrow	
Punkaharju	Method of Targeting:			_	_	0			1	0	1	0	0	-	-	-	-	-	 -	, %	\perp	
Δ,	Tark			d Q	٥	1 0	-1							_	-		\vdash	╁	+	1	\downarrow	
	to po	ton:		-													1	\vdash	\vdash	9	1	
Target:	Weth	Session:				ì														2	\perp	
						١.														7		1
				ncept																	1	
				Transcript Concept					face											^		1
				nscri					inter						1	3					1	2
12:40		;		Æ	1	62	down		rater	Fe 3	re 4	ing			Control of tw						,	5
		0.00	OTESBO		Picture 1	Picture 2	Up and down	Rocky	Land/water interface	Picture 3	Picture 4	Uprising	CLIff	Phords	3	880				0.00	,	epts
ě	pegin lime:	THE PARTY	Lengta of Session:	Concept	-	8	1 %	4	90	ø	-	80	6	2	=	: :	1 :	3 3	: :		ì	# of Concepts
i	e i	E .	Fe	ت	Ш	1		1		IOITA	ULAVZ	I I41	изси	TEV	-1	1				_		#

Table A-5 (continued)

28

Approved For Release 2000 Gle ASS HELED 00788R001800080001-5

			 -				ī	1	 r	- 1						1	1		3	4-13
	1981		PXRxQ Score	٥		63	6	_	80	°	7	80	6	10	77	12	133	14	e e	
#005	nber		PXRX	٥	-	64	m	*	40	6	80	6	91	12	15	18	20	25	vera	
₽ P	14 December 1981	В	Score	10	2	10	14	14	13	13									Weighted Average	
Viewer:	Date:	Class:	Quality (Q)	٠3	ı	က	ŧΩ	ស	4	4		-							Weigh	,
Ý1	ď	ខ	Rele- vance (R)	4	5	4	'n	10	5	ω									14	2
	,																		13	2
			4																12 1	
	8		Targ																=	
	Method of Targeting: Coordinate		Element of Target	ank	so.			80 80											10 1	- 2
88	8	61	Eleme	River bank	Buildings	River	River	Buildings	City	City								*	\vdash	
Inverness	108			超	Ba	H	FFF	B	ಶ	IJ							_		6	
In	arget		ď	-	1	1	1	1	1	1				_			_	<u> </u>	80	
	of T	ا	Q											_				_	7	
Target:	thod	Session:					ľ												9	
Ę	Me	S			ì														5	2
,			L L																4	2
			Conce																3	2
			n pt																2	
22			Transcript Concept		angle														-	-
15:23		on:		Mcture 1	Straight angles	Mcture 2		But 1dings	Man-made	u o									0	
••		Sessi		Pet	Stra	Het	River	But1	Man-	London								-	e e	80
Begin Time:	End Time:	Length of Session:	ii i	-	8	,,	4	80	9	~	80	•	l e	=	n	12	1	2	Score	# of Concepts
Begin	End 7	Lengt	Concept						L	<u> </u>			1_					<u>l</u>	J	Š
							,	1	MOITA	ULAV	I Idi	изсв	MT							to#
											29									

Table A-5 (continued)

Approved For Release 4364 A SSIFIE 26-00788R001800080001-5 Weighted Average 12 10 11 13 16 12 Date: 14 December 1981 15 2 14 듸 Viewer: Quality (Q) Class: ю Rele-vance (R) Element of Target 1 Coordinate 10 Buildings Bulldings Peninsula Buildings Buildings | 6 Town Bay Hangö Method of Targeting: А 9 Target: Session: S e Transcript Concept m Straight angles 15:23 0 Picture 1 Picture 2 Buildings Man-made Length of Session: Score # of Concepts London River Segin Time: End Time: 27 14 15 10 13 1

Table A-5 (continued)

TRANSCRIPT EVALUATION

30

UNCLASSIFIED Approved For Release 2000/08/08 : CIA-RDP96-00788R001800080001-5																									
111																					0.22	1			
	Γ	Score	0	-	64	en	•	10	9	۲-	,	20	a	10	11	12	13];	-						
1981		Pydky6	0	1	81	8	7	'n	9	60	Ľ	On .	ខ	12	15	16	20	ě			Average				
14 December 1981		Score	0	0 0		n	0	0	0												Weighted				
		Quality (Q)			1	1															¥.				
Viewer Date: Class:	H	8			2	8					T									14					
111	F																			2 13	1				
		Target																		11 12	-	-			
Noronha Coordinate		뛍																		101			nued)		
월 다 다		Element			Island	Ocean														6	+		Table A-5 (continued)		
Fernando Targeting:	ŀ	ч	0	0	-		0	۰	-									1		7 8		_	A-5		
	1	Д					-	\vdash	-	-	+	-		\vdash	-	-	-	+	-	4	,		Tab1e		
Target: . Method o Session:																				2	`				
1 1 1		apt																		7	-				
		t Conce																		,	\dashv				
e		Transcript Concept		sol on																E	-	2			
15:23	TOTA	Ε,	ture 1	145	9	ומ		egmrn7	n-made	nopu	4									_	<u> </u>	5			
Name:		-	-	*	2	i i	+	+	+	+	1		-	+	_		_	+	20		Scor	ncept			
Begin 1 End Tim	Lengta	Concep	-	<u> </u>	1	"	1	\perp			\perp						ř.	-	ä			of Co			
								NOIT	AUIA	L E	HIE	Уивс	яT									*			
									~ !	31	·	~ j F	- 9 -												
							U	N(JL.	A:	5	olt	- [[ŧυ											
#		Concept	Mcture	+	╁	LICONIE A	d.	o s	AUIA	31	418					13	13	14	15	_	Score	# of Concepts			

Approved For Release JNG & SIF-H5D: 6-00788R001800080001-5 2.11 Weighted Average 15 11 16 12 20 13 G) 20 Date: 14 December 1981 12 6 10 52 w 90 #005 10 23 Rele-wance Quality (R) (Q) Viewer: 14 12 Element of Target 11 Coordinate 10 Bridge Bridge Bridge δ Lakes Town Town Town Method of Targeting: Punkahar fu œ ۵, 9 Target: Session: 2 Н 4 --Transcript Concept m Straight angles 0 Begin Time: 15:23 Mcture 2 Buildings Length of Session: Man-made Picture London Score River # of Concepts End Time: Concept Number 2 13 14 6 9 11 TRANSCRIPT EVALUATION

Table A-5 (continued)

32

Approved For Release 210606-ASSIE-IED96-00788R001800080001-5

			l		•						ı		1			
End Time:			1	Met	Method of Targeting:	Targ	eting:		Coordinates		1	ă	Date:	14 December 1981	lber 19	12
Length of Session:	on:		١	Ses	Session:			3			1	Ü	Class:	æ		
Concept Number	Transc	Transcript Concept	cept		Q	<u>a</u>		Elemen	Element of Target	rget	#>	Rele- vance (R)	Quality (Q)	Score	Pydyg	8core
1 Pict	Picture 1					1	_	Buildings				2	1	'n.	٥	٥
2 Land,	Land/water interface	erface		1		1		River				44	4	12	-	-
3 Ridges	es es		7			0								0	67	63
4 Smal	Small ups and downs	downs				1		Buildings	es.			ıū	-	ເດ	60	က
S Cold						ī		Location				၈	-	n	7	*
6 Pict	Picture 2					1	_	Church				64	1	8	•0	10
7 Rocky	A:					-	0							0	9	ဖ
8 Pict	Picture 3				_	-	1	Buildings	90			N.	-	ĸ	œ	~
9 Pict	Picture 4					<u> </u>								0	ø	80
10 Frozen	en					-	٥							0	10	6
-	Feeling of town	E					-	City				5	4	13	21	10
-	Cliff on water							River bank	nk			1	н	1	15	=
13															16	12
14						-	-								30	13
15					\vdash	 -	-								25	14
Score	0	2	3 4	2	9	1	∞ '	9	10 11	12	13	14	, on	Weighted Average	AVer	400
# of Concepts	,		'					_		,						,

Table A-5 (continued)

33

Approved For Releas 400 2305 SIFIED 96-00788R001800080001-5

				, ,	<u> </u>															2.65
	186		Px8xQ Score	0	1	63	8	+	10	9	-	00	6	10	11	13	13	14		age
	ber 1		PXG	0	1	64	6	4	N)	9	œ	6	01	12	12	16	20	25		Aver
#005	14 December 1981	æ	Score	6	13	9	9	12	61	11	9	0	12	14	9					Weighted Average
Viewer:	Date: 1	Class:	Quality (Q)	2	4	8	81	4	1	5	63		4	ı,	8				:	we 18
V1.0	Dat	ដ	Rele- vance (R)	3	22	က	8	4	52	3	63		4	S.	3				14	Ī ·
1	ı	ı																	13	Ι,
			rget																12	·
	Coordinates		Element of Target								cks				cks				11	,
	Coord		ment		Peninsula	_		tion	ď		Sloping rocks		tion		Sloping rocks				1,0	
	***	3	Bie	Rocks	Penir	Rocks	Rocks	Location	Church	Rocks	Slop		Location	Town	Slop				6	
Hangö	getin		ρ,	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	-	-		8	•
	f Tar		Q																7	
Target:	Method of Targeting:	Session:																	9	
E E	Me	Set				١													5	ď
ı	1		t t																7	'
			Conce		90		80.												3	
			Transcript Concept		Land/water interface		Small ups and downs							TAM.	r				2	,
13:13			Trans	2 -1	er in		s and		83		တ	4		of to	n wate				-	_
13		ion:		Picture 1	nd/wat	Ridges	all up	9	Picture 2	Rocky	Picture 3	Picture 4	Frozen	Feeling of town	Cliff on water				<u> </u>	_
 		f Sesi		P1(Lai	Ri	Sm	Sold Display	Pi	Bo	P1	P1	Fr	F.	ដ				Score	pts
Begin Time:	End Time:	Length of Session:	Concept	1	ca	က	4	ro	စ	7	∞	6	ន្ទ	Ħ	27	13	14	15	SS	# of Concepts
Be	Ž.	I.	التا	1	L			N	OITA:	EAVIY	Tq18	Vasci	AT.	L	L	<u> </u>			ı	of

34

1 Hills by sea
1 Hills 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 7 6 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 7 6 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 7 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 7 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7
1 Hills by sea 12 13 14 15 15 14 15 16 15 16 16 16 16 16
1 Peak 3 3 6 6 6 6 6 6 6 6
1 Shoreline 3 2 6 6 6 6 6 6 6 6 6 6 6 6 6 6 6 6 6 6
1 Hills 1 3 10 8 7 1 Surf 3 1 3 9 8 0
1 Surf 3 1 3 9 8 1 3 9 8 1 3 9 8 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1
1 Hills by sea
1 Hills by sea
1 Hills by sea
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14

35

Approved For Release 274 C1/28 SSAFTED 6-00788R001800080001-5

																				2.42
	81		Beore	•	-	8	60	•	e	8		00	6	91	н	12	13	7		— —
2	er 19		Pydkyo	0	1	82	3	4	10	8	œ	6	10	12	15	16	8	25		lvera
#005	14 December 1981	В	Score	to.	13	2	12	12	4	۰	4	٥	13	13	0					Weighted Average
Viewer:	Date:	Class:	Quality (Q)	ι	4	2	4	4	-		1		4	2					/	Wei
<i>-</i>	ă	ວ	Rele- vance (R)	5	5	4	4	4	4		4		4	4					17.	
Punkharaja	Method of Targeting: Coordinates	- 1	Element of Target	Scattered lakes	Scattered lakes	Islands	Islands	Location	Islands		Islands		Location	Town					3 9- 10 11 12 13	3 2
Pun	arget		G,	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	0	1	1	0				8	1-1
إ	of T	ا ت	Δ																	1-1
Target:	Method	Session:				ì													9 5	
ı	į	i	ept																4	4
			Transcript Concept		e														<u>~</u>	H
			scrip		Land/water interface		Small ups and downs							T A	er.				1 2	
13:13		_	Tra	, -	ter i		ps an		~		8	4		Feeling of town	Cliff on water					3
		ssion		Picture 1	md/wa	Ridges	ы11 п	Co1d	Picture 2	Rocky	Picture 3	Picture 4	Frozen	eling	iff o				ـــــا	لــــل
Begin Time:	End Time:	Length of Session:	Concept Number	1 Pi	7	3	4 Str	රි	6 P1	7 Ro	80 P.	6	10 Fr	11 Fe	27	13	14	15	Score	of Concepts
Beg	Bnc	Lei	0=	L1		1	1	 NI	ortau	EAVI	MIR	ВУИВС	т 	1	1		l			# of (

Table A-5 (continued)

Approved For Release 2000/08/ASSIFIED 96-00788R001800080001-5 Weighted Average 1.21 15 11 12 10 20 13 16 12 14 December 1981 #005 2 2 Felter Tance Quality (R) (Q) Υιewer: Date: Class: 14 13 12 Rlement of Target 11 Method of Targeting: Coordinates (continued) Sloping bank 10 River banks River Grass Banks Trees River 6 Banks River Inverness Area ∞ 0 Table A-5 • Target: Session: 9 S 4 Transcript Concept Land/water interfaces ~ \sim 1 Ś 12:46 Winding river Deep valley Descending Mcture 3 Picture 1 Length of Session: Mcture Trees Jungle Water Green Flat Score # of Concepts Begin Time: End Time: 14 91 11 2 13

TRANSCRIPT EVALUATION

37

Approved For Release 1066 AS SIFIED 96-00788R001800080001-5

en.	Begin Time:	12:46	Target		Haı	Hangö				ĻĄ	Viewer:	*	#005		
**	End Time:		Method of Targeting:	f Targ	eting		Coordinates	tes	ı	Da	Date:	14 December 1981	ember	1981	-
H	ength of	Length of Session:	Session:			4				ទ	Class:	В			1
	Concept	Transcript Concept		<u>a</u>	ρ,	Elemen	Element of Target	urget		Rele- vance (R)	Quality (Q)	Score.	PXBxQ	PxfxQ Score	
	1	bown jagged		1		Sloping rocks	rocks			6	2	9	٥	0	
	81	Picture 1		1		Sloping rocks	rocks			က	2	9	1	1	
	8	Flat "	ì	1		Вау				3	1	8	69	2	
	*	Water		1		Bay				3	4	10	က	60	
b	10	Green			0							0	4	4	
OITA	9	Picture 2	·	-	-1	Sloping rocks	rocks			8	1	ы	10	10	
EAVIN	7	Down/up		-	0							0	ø	9	
Tan	œ	Deep valley										0	80	2	
¥изсв	۵	Picture 3		63									G.	80	
яT	o	Down		_		Sloping rocks	rocks			3	1	က	2	6	
	=	Land/water interfaces		-	-	Peninsula	la la			c)	4	13	21	91	
	12	Descending		-	-	Sloping rocks	rocks			ဗ	1	က	15	п	
	13	Trees			-	Trees				8	4	7	16	12	
	14	Winding river		-	-	Вау				3	1	n	20	13	
	ន្ទ	Jungle	Ţ	,	1	Trees				64	60	ဖ	25	14	
	Ň	Score 0 1 2 3 4	5 6	7	8	6	10 11	12	13	14	13	44		980	
*	of Concepts	epts 3 5 2 1 3	3	1					1			אבופוורפת טאבומפת	15.44	200	1.38
			E	<	٥	makia A-5 (continued)	(۵۹)								

38

											LA													
1	, 	Aŗ	op 	rove	ed F	or R	Rele	ase	200	00/0	8/0	8 : (CIA	-RI)P	96	-00	788	R00	180		2.22	1-5	•
			1	Score	٥	г	64	60	4	60	9	7	80	6		ខ្ម	Ħ	12	13	7		age		
	er 198			9,0,0	•	-	72	6	4	90	9	œ	6	93		27	15	16	20	25		Average		
#002	14 December 1981	g		Score	10	122	٥	12	9	4	4	0		,	-	13	4	6	-	6		Weighted		
Viewer:			28	Quality g.	8	4		4	က	-	1				1	4	1	so.	83	ıc		Wei	İ	
Ý1ev	Date:	ŧ	Class:	Nele- vance (R)	4	4		4	67	4	4			Τ,	-	2	4	64	4	77	14			
				25		-									†						13			
				t l																	12		2	
	ates			Targ		•											W.				11			
onha	Coordinates	╽.	4	Element of Target					ton								t 1411	tion.		tion	10		-	(pen
Fernando de Noronha	၂ 8			Eleme	H1118	H1118		Ocean	Vegetation	H1118	H111s				Sloping hills	Island	Sloping hills	Vegetation	Ocean	Vegetation	*6	T	2	Table A-5 (continued)
opue o	Mathod of Targeting:				H	113		8	Ve	H	H	_	-	╁	+	_	-	-		H	8			8
Forns	Proper	9 70		Q,	-	-	•	н	-	-	-	-	+-	╁╴	7		-	-	1		1	T	7	A-5
	ءِ ا ت	5	ä	_	_	_	_	_	-	_		-	\ ·	+	+		-	-			9		-	able
E	Mathod of		Session:																		5	T	2	Ĥ
															١						7		3	
	1	١	-	rcept			1														٣		2	
		١		Franscript Concept												سر و ر ه					2		۲	
		١		nscril	_								A			4 4 4			467		lE		4	
:	12:40	١	ا		lagge	1 92				6		;	Deep valley	3		pand from the conference	Descending		Wanding maps]e	0		2	
			Session		Down jagged	Picture 1	Flat	Water	Georgia	g stuto	nom/ma		Deep	Mcture 3	Down		Dogue	Troes	, a	Jungle	aro.		epts	
	Segin Time:	ind Time:	Length of Session:	Concept	-	6		1		, «	, ,		20	6	10	=	2	2	1 2	15		0	of Concepts	

39

TRANSCRIPT EVALUATION

Approved For Release NG 205 St FAED 96-00788R001800080001-5

Seesion: Seesion: A Coordinates Distance A December 1981 Seesion: A Coordinates Distance A December 1981 Seesion: A December 1981 A December 1982 A Dec	Session: Session: A Coordinates Date: 14 December 1989 Date: 15 December 1989 Date: 15 December 1989 Date: D	Begin Time:	: 98	12:46	46				Ten	Target:		Punkaharju	arju				١	.>	V1cwer:	*	*005			1
Seesion: Transcript Concept D P Element of Target Target	Time							Me	thod	of Ta	rget11		Coord	inates		١	А	ate:	14 Dec	ember	1981		1	
Trenscript Concept D P Element of Target Target	Transcript Concept D P Element of Target Target	gth o	f Sessie	: H			Ì		Ses	sston				4			1	0	lass:		B			1
Column Jaggic Column C	Cutture 1 Area 0 1 Area 4 3 10 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2	oncept usber		4	ransc	1dpt	conce	4			Ω	а,	[2]	ement	of T	urget		Rele- vance (R)	Quality (Q)	1		6X 6X	9. TO	
Interest tetr 1 ATes 4 3 10 1 1 Ates 4 3 10 2 4 <td>1</td> <td>Down</td> <td>Jagg</td> <td>g.</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>0</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>٥</td> <td></td> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> <td></td>	1	Down	Jagg	g.							0								٥		0	0		
Lates Area 4 3 10 2 3 recurred Councing 5 1 Late bottoms 5 1 5 1 4 4 Councing 5 1 5 1 5 1 5	The latter 1 Area 4 3 10 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2	64	Pictu	re 1								1	Isl	ands				4	ო	10		7		
treen 5 4 13 3 4 1 4 4 1 4 4 1 4 4 1 4 4 1 4 1 4 1 4 1 1 4 1 1 4 1 1 4 1 1 1 1 4 1 1 4 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 <th< td=""><td> Table Actions 1 Table Dottons 5 4 13 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 </td><td>8</td><td>Flat</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td>ì</td><td></td><td></td><td>1</td><td>Are</td><td>et .</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td>4</td><td>က</td><td>91</td><td></td><td>N</td><td>63</td><td></td></th<>	Table Actions 1 Table Dottons 5 4 13 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4	8	Flat						ì			1	Are	et .				4	က	91		N	63	
toture 2 Loture 2 Jungle Loture 2 Jungle Loture 2 Jungle Loture 2 Jungle Jungle Loture 2 Jungle	Column C	4	Water				2	**					Lak	89				2	4	13			က	
cture 2 1 lake bottoms 5 1 5 1 5 1 5 1 5 6 7 8 7 9 8 7 9 8 7 9 9 10 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 12 11 12 11 11	cturre 2 1 lake bottoms 5 1 5 1 5 1 5 1 5 1 5 1 5 1 5 1 5 1 5 1 5 1 5 6 7 6 1		Green	_								0								0		4	4	
compute 5 1 Take bottoms 5 1 5 1 5 1 5 1 5 8 7 comparint ovan comparint 1 Takes 5 1 5 1 5 1 5 1 9 8 conding 1 Trees 2 4 1 4 15 11 trees Trees 2 4 1 4 15 11 Trees 2 4 1 4 15 11 Trees 2 4 1 4 15 11 Trees 3 4 1 1 4 1 4 15 15 14 Trees 3 4 5 5 4 7 16 13 Trees 3	cep valley cep valley cep valley 1 lake bottoms 5 1 5 6 8 7 cep valley 5 1 5 1 5 8 7 cec add mates 2 1 1 lake bottoms 5 4 1 8 7 and værter 1 1 lake bottoms 5 4 1 4 10 9 and værter 1 1 lake bottome 4 1 4 15 10 9 trees unding river 1 1 mates 2 4 7 16 13 14 15 13 14 15 13 14 15 13 14 15 13 14 15 15 14 15 15 14 15 15 14 15 15 14 15	9	Pot	ire 2								-	Fe	e bott	Simo			20	1	£		2	10	
eep valley 1 Lake bottoms 5 1 5 1 5 1 5 1 5 1 5 9 8 corn and/water interfaces escending resc 1 1 1 1 1 4 1 4 1	eep valley 1 Lake bottoms 5 1 5 1 5 1 5 8 7 count and/water interfaces escending resc 1 Lake bottoms 5 4 13 10 9 8 resc 1 Lake bottoms 5 4 13 10 9 secending 1 Interes 2 4 1 4 15 11 thes 1 Interes 2 4 7 16 13 thes 1 Interes 2 4 7 16 13 thes 1 Interes 2 4 7 16 13 thes 1 1 1 1 2 3 4 1 1 3 4 1 1 3 4	-	Down,	g.								-	, Fak	e bott	SIEC			10	1	S		9	9	
loture 3 2 Interpretations 5 1 5 4 13 9 8 escending restanding restanding 1 1 1 1 1 4 1 4 15 10 9 10 1	loture 3 Corn. and/water interfaces 1 lakes 5 1 5 4 13 12 10 9 8 escending rees 1 Indiag river 0 1 1 1 1 1 2 4 1 4 15 11 12 13 14 15 13 14 15 13 14 15 13 14 15 13 14 15 13 14 15 13 14 15 13 14 15 13 14 15 14 15 14 15 14 15 14 15 14 15 14 15 14 15 14 15 14 15 14 15 14 15 14 15 14 15 14 15 14 15 14 15 14 15 14 15 14 14 15 14 1	00	Deep	vall	, a							-	, ag	e bott	Smo			ιo	1	10		60	7	
own 1 Inditing river Colspan="6">1 Inditing river 1 Inditing river 1 Inditing river 2 4 1 4 1 <td>own 1 Index Dottoms 5 1 5 1 5 1</td> <td>6</td> <td>Mch</td> <td>are 3</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>61</td> <td></td> <td>6</td> <td>90</td> <td></td>	own 1 Index Dottoms 5 1 5 1 5 1	6	Mch	are 3							61											6	90	
Seconding	and/water interfaces 1 interfaces 5 4 13 12 13 14 15 13 14 15 11 11 11 12 13 14 15 11 14 15 11 12 13 14 15 11 12 13 14 15 13 14 15 13 14 15 13 14 15 13 14 17 14 17 14 17 14 17 14 17 14 17 14 17 14 15 14 14 15 14 15 14 15 14 15 14 15 14 15 14 15 14 15 14 14 14 14 14 14 14 14 14 15 14 15 14 15 14 15 14 15 14 15 14 15 14 14 14 14 14 14 14 14 14 14	្ព	Down									H	Lak	e bott	Smo			s.	1	ស		2	6	
escendings 1 Instances 4 1 4 15 15 12 Trees 2 4 7 16 12 Inding river 1 Trees 5 2 9 20 13 Inding river 1 Trees 2 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 Meighted Average	Trees	=	Land	/wate	r int	erface	82						Lak	80				23	4	13			10	
Trees 1 Trees 2 4 7 16 12 13 14 15 15 15 15 15 15 15	Trees Tuding river O 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 18 11 12 13 14 14 15 14 15 14 15 14 15 15	2	Desc	uipue	60							1	Isl	ands				4	-	4		15	Ħ	
Inding river Ungle 1 Connected lakes 5 2 9 20 13 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 18 11 12 13 14 Weighted Average	Inding river Ungle 1 Connected lakes 5 2 9 20 13 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 18 11 12 13 14 2 6 1 2 3 4 1 1 2 2 2 1 Weighted Average	13	Tree									1	Tre	es es				62	4	-		-	12	
Unugle 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 The state of t	Ungle 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 2 6 1 2 3 4 1 1 1 2 2 2 3 Table A-5 (concluded)	14	Wind	ing r	lver							1	Con	necte	1 lake	8		ß	82	6		20	13	
0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 Weighted Average	0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 Weighted Average 2 6 1 2 3 4 1 1 2 2 2 2	15	Jung	le								1	Tre	88				73		69	_		7	
2 6 1 2 3 4 1 1 2 2	2 6 1 2 3 4 1 1 2 2 2	Scc	L	0		2	3	4	5	9	7	8	6	1.6	11	12	\vdash	14	Wei	ghted	Ave	rage		2
		oncef	pts	2	9	1	2	3	7		-		1	2		2						·	_	

40

Approved For Relea 1 2 6 6 5 5 5 6 6 9 6 - 00788 R001800080001 - 5

(U) Two types of overall assessment were chosen to emphasize the versatility of the evaluation procedure, (1) a simple rank ordering based on weighted average scores, and (2) a concept-by-concept, non-parametric, statistical technique. Table A-6 shows the results of the first method, the rank ordering. For convenience, the correct matches are underlined.

Table A-6

(U) A RANK ORDERING OF WEIGHTED AVERAGES (U)

Session/Target	Inverness	Hangö	Fernando de Noronha	Punkaharju
2 3 4	4.13* 1.12 1.21 1.53	2.72 2.65 1.38 2.52	0.22 2.49 2.22 2.36	2.11 2.42 2.21 0.90

^{*}Scores computed with non-uniform target relevance factors.

- (U) From Table A-6, we see that there were 3 first-place matches and 1 fourth-place match. The probability of obtaining 3 of 4 possible first-place matches, from chance fluctuations alone are less than 0.051. The point spread between the best match (Inverness) and the worst match (Punkaharju) are in qualitative agreement with a subjective "first look" at the quality of the transcripts as well.
- (U) The second analysis determines the significance of the difference between the correct concept/target matches and a control set of matches. All concept/target matches that are not the correct matches act as an internal control set. To avoid any invalid assumptions as to the correct parent distribution, a non-parametric statistical test, the Mann-Whitney U-Test, was chosen for the analysis.

41

Approved For Release 2000/08/08 : CIA-RDP96-00788R001800080001-5

- (U) It is beyond the scope of this report to review the details of the Mann-Witney U-Test; thus, only the results are quoted here. The probability that the set of correct concept/target matches is statistically indistinguishable from the control concept/target matches is less than 0.071.
- (U) There are a number of additional statistical procedures that could be used to analyze the results of this evaluation technique. The two cited above, however, represent a spread in complexity that demonstrates the internal consistency of the basic evaluation procedure. With only four similar RV sessions, the evaluation technique nearly reached the 0.05 level of statistical significance with each of the two statistical procedures, a result indicating a successful outcome with regard to the overall assessment procedure.

42

Approved For Release 2000/08/08: CIA-RDF96-00788R001800080001-5

Appendix B

(U) SUMMARY OF EVALUATION TECHNIQUE (U)

Step	Action
1	Task coordinator defines the evaluation goal. He/she identifies target elements and assigns target element relevance factors as appropriate.
2	Analyst conceptualizes responses and prepares an RV assessment sheet for each response.
3	Repeated concepts are noted in the "D" column.
4	Copies of the sheets from Item 2 are made; one for each possible target used in the analysis.
	FOR EACH POSSIBLE RESPONSE/TARGET COMBINATION:
5	Identify a target element for each concept not marked in the "D" column; mark a 1 in the "p" column and write the target element and its relevance factor from Step 1 in the appropriate columns. (Write 0 and blanks if no element can be found.)
6	Using Table 3, assign a quality rating for all present $(p=1)$ concept/element combinations.
7	Compute the score as follows:
	a. Calculate relevance (R) X quality (Q)
	b. Convert R X Q to an integer between 0 and 14 using the conversion table provided.
8	Enter the number of concepts that obtained each possible score in the space provided.
9	Calculate the weighted average using:
	$A_{k} = 0.357 \left[\Sigma f_{j} \sqrt{f_{j}} S_{j} / \Sigma f_{j} \sqrt{f_{j}} \right]$
	where: S, is the score and f, is the number of concepts that obtained score j
	j = 0, 1, 2,, 14
10	For each response, rank order the weighted averages.

43

Approved For Releas Jan Gla S. S. F. E. D. 96-00788 R001800080001-5

REFERENCES (U)

- H. E. Puthoff and R. Targ, "A Perceptual Channel for Information Transfer over Kilometer Distances: Historical Perspective and Recent Research," Proc. IEEE, Vol. 64, No. 3, pp. 329-354 (March 1976).
- C. Scott, "On the Evaluation of Verbal Material in Parapsychology:
 A Discussion of Dr. Pratt's Monograph," <u>J. Soc. Psych. Res</u>., Vol. 46,
 No. 752, pp. 79-90 (June 1972).
- 3. R. Targ, H. E. Puthoff, and E. C. May, "State of the Art in Remote Viewing Studies at SRI," Technical Session on Research in Psychoenergetics, Proc. 1977 IEEE International Conf. on Cybernetics and Society, Washington, D.C. (September 20, 1977).
- 4. S. Siegel, Nonparametric Statistics, pp. 116-120 (McGraww-Hill, 1956).

44